John E. Pollino, OSB No. 925202 jpollino@ghrlawyers.com GARRETT HEMANN ROBERTSON P.C. 1011 Commercial Street N.E. Salem, Oregon 97301-1049 Tel: (503) 581-1501 Fax: (503) 581-5891

Of Attorneys for Defendants Lively, Symes, Mixon, Ogletree Deakins, and Seymour

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF OREGON EUGENE DIVISION

ANDREW CLARK No. 6:20-cv-00253-AA

Plaintiff,

VS.

WELLS FARGO BANK, OGLETREE DEAKINS NASH SMOAK STEWART, P.C., OREGON BAR ASSOCIATION, LEAH C LIVELY, DAVID P.R. SYMES, CHRISTOPHER MIXON, MICHAEL HOGAN, ALEX GARDNER, ERIK HASSELMAN, STEVEN SEYMOUR, CHRISTIAN ROWLEY, BENJAMIN GUTMAN, BARRY DAVIS, DAVID CAMPBELL, BRUCE NEWTON, PETER URIAS, ELLEN ROSEBLUM, SABASTIAN NEWTON TAPIA, BEN MILLER, and VANESSA NORDYKE

DEFENDANT'S OGLETREE DEAKINS NASH SMOAK STEWART, P.C., LEAH LIVELY, DAVID SYMES, CHRISTOPHER MIXON AND STEVEN SEYMOUR'S REPLY IN SUPORRT OF MOTION FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER AND TO DECLARE PLAINTIFF A VEXATIOUS LITIGANT

Defendants.

## I. REPLY

Defendants Ogletree, Deakins, Nash, Smoak, & Stewart, P.C. ("Ogletree"); Leah Lively;

David Symes; Christopher Mixon (collectively "Ogletree Defendants"); and Steven Seymour

respectfully submit the following Reply in Support of Defendants' Motion for Protective Order

and to Declare Plaintiff a Vexatious Litigant. Plaintiff has failed to address the issues raised in

the Ogletree Defendants' and Mr. Seymour's Motion for Protective Order, and thus, the Motion

should be granted, limiting Plaintiff's communications and declaring him a vexatious litigant.

Since the time of defendants' filings, Plaintiff has continued to engage in abusive and

harassing communications of the Ogletree Defendants, Mr. Seymour, and now current counsel.

Declaration of John E. Pollino in Support of Reply in Support of Motion to Dismiss and

Reply in Support of Motion for Protective Order and to Declare Plaintiff a Vexatious

Litigant ("Pollino Decl."), ¶ 4, Ex. 1. The Ogletree Defendants and Mr. Seymour seek an order

to enjoin Plaintiff from communicating with them directly, to require Plaintiff maintain

professional communication with represented counsel, and to limit Plaintiff's ability to further

abuse the legal system with his frivolous filings and harassing behavior. Plaintiff has a long and

documented history of engaging in vexatious behaviors, as described in the Motion for Protective

Order, and other defendants in this matter have similarly requested assistance from this Court in

monitoring and limiting Plaintiff's abusive communications. See, e.g., Wells Fargo's Ex Parte

Application for an Order to Limit Pl.'s Contact with Wells Fargo and Direct

Communications to Its Counsel of Record Only, and for Sanctions, ECF No. 72.

Plaintiff has also included false claims in his latest filing in response to the Motion for

Protective Order. Specifically, he has claimed that the undersigned counsel lied to this Court

regarding conferral with Plaintiff on the Ogletree Defendants' and Mr. Seymour's Motion to

Dismiss and Motion for Protective Order. Pl.'s Objection, ECF No. 74, p. 2. This claim is

patently false, as the Declaration submitted in support of both motions' states:

"I certify that on April 8, 2020, I wrote to Plaintiff to confer

regarding the dismissal of Plaintiff's complaint and to discuss the

DEFENDANT'S REPLY IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER AND TO DECLARE PLAINTIFF A VEXATIOUS LITIGANT: Clark v Wells Fargo, et al.

bases for the filing of the defendants' motions. Plaintiff disputed the bases for filing defendants' motions and thus the motions are submitted for the Court's consideration. True and correct copies of my communication and Plaintiff's responses are attached as *Exhibit 20*."

Conferral regarding these motions may not have occurred by telephone, but given Plaintiff's history of abusive and harassing communications, the undersigned counsel determined the appropriate course of action would be to document all communication with Plaintiff in writing.<sup>1</sup> All evidence of those communications has been provided to this Court.

Plaintiff also claims there was "no stalking and there was no stalking protection order," which is similarly false. Pl.'s Objections, ECF No. 74, p. 3. Plaintiff himself submitted the "stalking protection order" as an exhibit to his own Complaint. ECF No. 1-1, pp. 48-49. Plaintiff's disagreement with his previous plea agreement and protection order and his personal, unsubstantiated belief that his criminal conviction was "false arrest and entirely manufactured crime" does not negate their existence. In making this argument to the Court, Plaintiff has falsely represented previous events that actually occurred. These facts should be considered by this Court in deciding whether a Protective Order and an Order Declaring Plaintiff a Vexatious Litigant would be appropriate in this case.

////

\_

¹ Other defense counsel in this matter have acted in a similar fashion, given Plaintiff's history. In its Ex Parte Application to Limit Plaintiff's Contact with Wells Fargo, Wells Fargo's Counsel stated "Wells Fargo holds a good faith belief that any attempts to meet and confer with Plaintiff would be futile as demonstrated by its past meet and confer attempts with Plaintiff asking him to cease communications with wells Fargo and affiliated persons and entities except through counsel of record, but Plaintiff disregarded Wells Fargo's requests." Wells Fargo's Ex Parte Application, ECF No. 74, p. 2, n. 1. Plaintiff currently demonstrates a continuing disregard for requests to cease communication with represented parties, as demonstrated by the undersigned counsel's request for him to direct communication to represented counsel on April 8, 2020, and Plaintiff's continuing practice of abusive and harassing communications with the Ogletree Defendants, Mr. Seymour, and others represented by counsel in this matter. See Mot. for Protective Order, ECF No. 63, p. 1; Pollino Decl., ¶ 4, Ex. 1.

Plaintiff begins his "Objection to Motion for Protective Order and Reply to Mr. Pollino

and Client's April 9, 2020 Response" (hereinafter "Objection") by attaching an email he sent to

Assistant United States Attorney Pam Holsinger. In the email attachment and Objection,

Plaintiff cites no new facts, arguments, or inferences to counter the arguments raised in the

Ogletree Defendants' and Mr. Seymour's Motion for Protective Order. He does not dispute the

arguments raised regarding the need for a protective order or the request to declare him a

vexatious litigant. He circularly cites to "Docket 56," as he has in other responsive filings in this

case, notably in his "Reply to Resp. (partial)" filed on April 20, 2020 (ECF No. 73).

"Docket 56" is Plaintiff's Motion for Judicial Notice of Adjudicative Facts and Clarification of

Claim for Relief, which similarly cites to Plaintiff's Complaint and various other documents

already submitted to this Court, either in this or in previously litigated matters (which Plaintiff

has referred to this Court by referencing "PACER" filings repeatedly).

Plaintiff also makes unsupported legal conclusions that should not be given the inference

of truth by this Court under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. See Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S.

662, 678-79 (2009). Plaintiff expresses concern that Wells Fargo is "not aware of the actual

details of this situation." Pl.'s Objection, p. 2. Of note, the undersigned counsel does not

represent Wells Fargo. Wells Fargo has its own counsel, so it is unclear why Plaintiff addressed

that non-relevant concern in his Objection to the Ogletree Defendants' and Mr. Seymour's

Motion for Protective Order.

Finally, Plaintiff asserts that the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure are an insufficient basis

for the defendants' arguments and this Court's actions. Pl.'s Objection, ECF No. 74, p. 3.

However, the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure are promulgated by the United States Supreme

Court pursuant to the Rules Enabling Act (28 U.S.C. § 2072) with the express purpose to

DEFENDANT'S REPLY IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER AND TO DECLARE PLAINTIFF A

"govern the procedure in all civil actions and proceedings in the United States district courts ...

They should be construed, administered, and employed by the court and the parties to secure the

just, speedy, and inexpensive determination of every action and proceeding." Fed. R. Civ. P. 1.

By asserting that the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure should not govern this action, Plaintiff

proves why this Court must issue a Protective Order and Declare Plaintiff a Vexatious Litigant.

Without represented counsel, Plaintiff lacks sufficient knowledge, and continues to thwart, the

rules of this Court. Without appropriate limitations on his conduct, Plaintiff will persist in

attempting to circumvent the rules governing the courts and engage in vexatious behavior,

further abusing the legal system.

II. CONCLUSION

Because of the lack of appropriate response from Plaintiff, for the above reasons and

those cited in defendants' motion and based on the trial court file, this Court should enjoin

Plaintiff from communicating with the defendants except through represented counsel, and enter

an order declaring Plaintiff a vexatious litigant, subjecting further filings by plaintiff against

Defendants Lively, Symes, Mixon, Ogletree Deakins, and Seymour, and their represented

counsel, to pre-filing review.

DATED this 4th day of May, 2020.

GARRETT HEMANN ROBERTSON P.C.

s/John E Pollino

John E Pollino OSB No. 925202

503-581-1501

503-581-5891 (FAX)

jpollino@ghrlawyers.com

Of Attorneys for Defendants Ogletree, Deakins, Nash, Smoak & Stewart, P.C., Leah Lively, Steven Seymour,

Christopher Mixon, and David Symes

DEFENDANT'S REPLY IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER AND TO DECLARE PLAINTIFF A VEXATIOUS LITIGANT: Clark v Wells Fargo, et al.

Page - 5

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I caused to be served the foregoing **Defendant's Reply in Support** of Motion for Protective Order and to Declare Plaintiff a Vexatious Litigant on the date indicated below,

[X] Via First-Class Mail with postage prepaid
[X] Via Electronic Filing
[ ] Via Facsimile Transmission
[ ] Via Hand Delivery
[ ] Via Overnight Delivery

to the following person(s) a true copy thereof, contained in a sealed envelope (if other than by electronic filing notice), addressed to said person(s) at their last known addresses indicated below:

Andrew Clark 3270 Stoney Ridge Rd. Eugene, OR 97405 *Phone: 541-510-3915* 

Email: <u>operationsunriselaw@gmail.com</u>

Plaintiff pro se

Christian Rowley Seyfarth Shaw LLP 560 Mission Street, Suite 3100 San Francisco, CA 94105 Phone: (415) 544-1001 Fax: (415) 397-8549

Email: <u>crowley@seyfarth.com</u>

Of Attorney for Defendant's Wells Fargo,

Christian Rowley, and Peter Urias

Jessica B. Spooner (OSB No. 105919)

Department of Justice 1162 Court St. NE Salem, OR 97301 Phone: 503-947-4700 Fax: 503-947-4791

Email: <u>Jessica.Spooner@doj.state.or.us</u> Of Attorneys for defendant's Alex

Gardner, Erik Hasselman, Ellen Rosenblum,

Helen M. McFarland (OSB No 013176)

Seyfarth Shaw LLP 800 5th Avenue Ste 4100

Seattle, WA 98104 Phone: 206-946-4923

Email: <a href="mailto:hmcfarland@seyfarth.com">hmcfarland@seyfarth.com</a>
Of Attorney for Defendant's Wells
Fargo, Christian Rowley, and Peter Urias

Nik T. Chourey (OSB No. 060478) Amber A. Hollister (OSB No. 035458)

Oregon State Bar

16037 SW Upper Boones Ferry Rd

P.O. Box 231935

Tigard, OR 97281-1935 Phone:(503) 431-6312 Fax: (503) 598-6912 nchourey@osbar.org ahollister@osbar.org

Of Attorneys for Oregon State Bar

Tom C. Spooner (*OSB No. 075310*)

Spooner & Much, P.C. 530 Center Street NE

Ste 712

Salem, OR 97301 503-378-7777

Email: <u>tspooner@smapc.com</u>
Of Attorney for Barry Davis

Benjamin Gutman and Vanessa Nordyke

Billy M. Sime (*OSB 823932*)

Parks Bauer Sime Winkler & Fernety LLP

570 Liberty Street SE

Suite 200

Salem, OR 97301

(503) 371-3502

Fax: (503) 371-0429

Email: bsime@pbswlaw.com

Of Attorney for David Campbell

Sebastian Tapia (OSB No. 043761)

Lane County Office of Legal Counsel

Lane County Courthouse

125 East 8th Avenue

Eugene, OR 97401 *Phone: 541-682-3728* 

Fax: 541-682-3803

Email: sebastian.tapia@co.lane.or.us

Of Attorney for Sabastian Newton Tapia

Jared Hager (OSB No.

U.S. Attorney's Office

District of Oregon, Civil Division

1000 SW 3rd Ave, Suite 600

Portland, OR 97204

Phone: 503-727-1120

Fax: 503-727-1117

Email: jared.hager@usdoj.gov

Of Attorneys for Michael Hogan

David A. Jacobs (OSB No. 942202)

Luvaas Cobb

777 High Street

Suite 300

Eugene, OR 97401

Phone: (541)484-9292

Fax: (541)343-1206

Email: djacobs@luvaascobb.com

Of Attorney for Bruce Newton

Sivhwa Go (*OSB No. 033252*)

Eugene City Attorney's Office

125 E 8th Avenue

Eugene, OR 97401

Phone: 541-682-8447

Fax:: 541 682-5414 Email: hgo@eugene-or.gov

Of Attorney for Ben Miller

DATED this 4th day of May, 2020.

GARRETT HEMANN ROBERTSON P.C.

s/John E Pollino

John E Pollino OSB No. 925202

503-581-1501

503-581-5891 (FAX)

ipollino@ghrlawyers.com

Of Attorneys for Defendants Ogletree, Deakins, Nash, Smoak & Stewart, P.C., Leah Lively, Steven Seymour,

Christopher Mixon, and David Symes